

**Section III:**  
**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the**  
**DRAWINGS**

In Figure 2, applicant(s) proposes to delete the reference number "30" from association with the interprocess connector element "B".

In Figure 3, applicant(s) proposes to delete the reference number "31" from association with the interprocess connector element "B".

In Figure 4, applicant(s) proposes to change the reference number associated with the "access denied" step from "48" to "49".

**Section IV:**  
**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121**  
**REMARKS**

**Objections to the Figures**

In the Office Action, objections to Figures 3 and 4 were made for inconsistency or re-use of certain reference numbers. In the foregoing "Amendments to the Drawings" section, proposed changes are made to remedy these issues, and the Appendix to this reply illustrates those changes in red ink for the examiner's review.

A letter to the draftsman and replacement sheets for Figures 2, 3 and 4 are included herewith. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is requested by the applicant(s).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the Office Action, the examiner has rejected claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for reasons of lack of antecedent basis for the term or element "said protected resource". Claims 1 and 10 are amended in the present reply to refer to "a protected resource of said given affiliated domain".

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for Claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is requested by applicant(s).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 4, 6 - 13, 15 - 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over European Patent Office patent application #1089516 to Grandcolas (hereinafter "Grandcolas") in view of US published patent application 2002/0010776 to Lerner (hereinafter "Lerner"). Claims 5, 14, and 23 were rejected over Grandcolas in view of Lerner in further view of US published patent application 2002/0078192 to Kopsell (hereinafter "Kopsell").

Examiner has stated that Grandcolas and Lerner do not teach our method of modifying a home domain identity cookie to record an enrollment success indicator, but that Kopsell teaches this method at paragraph [0025], lines 19 - 37.

Grandcolas fails to teach or suggest use of a single cookie (e.g. our home domain cookie), passed among all of the affiliated domains to accumulate successful enrollment symbols in a star topology with the user's browser at the center of the star topology, but instead teaches use of a single, shared cookie in which a common sub-domain is indicated, thereby requiring entry of a "forward to" entry in each Domain Name Service ("DNS") for each associated domain:

[0045] In an embodiment, servers sharing information between themselves that are maintained by different organizations use a shared domain in common in order to ease the sharing of information. In such an embodiment, a sub-domain is established or designated as the common sub-domain, the domain attribute of the authentication token (e.g., the shared cookie) is designated as the common sub-domain, and a "Forward IP (Internet Protocol) Pointer" entry is added in the DNS name servers of the cooperating organizations.

Therefore, there would be no motivation to modify Grandcolas to eliminate their common sub-domain in favor of accumulating enrollment success symbols as applicant's invention does in the shared cookie.

Kopsell teaches of a cookie having modifiable data values, but fails to teach modifying those values to include a plurality of enrollment success symbols from a plurality of affiliated domains, said success symbols being accumulated through a process of passing the token among the home domain and affiliated servers in a star topology with the user's web browser being at the center of the star.

Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to include the details of our process and mechanisms to generate a home domain identity cookie having an accumulation of enrollment success indicators as set forth in our disclosure paragraphs [0048] through [0064], whereby a user is automatically enrolled in a *group* of affiliated domains, not just a single affiliated domain.

For these reasons, Grandcolas in view of Lerner, and Grandcolas in view of Lerner in further view of Lerner fails to teach all of the elements, steps, or limitations of our claims. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

**Conclusion**

Applicant requests entry of the amendment, approval of the replacement drawing sheets, and allowance of the claims for the foregoing reasons.

Respectfully,

*Robert Frantz*

Agent for Applicant(s)

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

Tel: (405) 812-5613

**Appendix:**  
**DRAWINGS SHOWING PROPOSED CHANGES**  
**IN MARK-UP FORM USING**  
**RED INK**

Please see the attached three pages for Sheets 2, 3 and 4 of , in which changes are proposed and shown in red ink.





Figure 2





Figure 3




Figure 4